

LARGE JAIL NETWORK BULLETIN

Volume 2, No. 1- June 1990

Contents

| | |
|---|------------------|
| <i>Network News</i> | <i>1</i> |
| <i>Large Jail Network Meeting Facilitates Information-Sharing</i> | <i>2</i> |
| <i>The Hampden County Day Reporting Center: Three Years' Success in Supervising Sentenced Individuals in the Community</i> | <i>6</i> |
| <i>Cook/Chill Centralized Food Service in Corrections</i> | <i>8</i> |
| <i>Circuit-Riding Hearing Officers Improve the Adjudication Process</i> | <i>11</i> |
| <i>The State of Jail Industries</i> | <i>13</i> |
| <i>Recommended Reading</i> | <i>17</i> |

LARGE JAIL NETWORK BULLETIN

Volume 2, No. 1- June 1990

Contents

| | |
|---|------------------|
| <i>Network News</i> | <i>1</i> |
| <i>Large Jail Network Meeting Facilitates Information-Sharing</i> | <i>2</i> |
| <i>The Hampden County Day Reporting Center: Three Years' Success in Supervising Sentenced Individuals in the Community</i> | <i>6</i> |
| <i>Cook/Chill Centralized Food Service in Corrections</i> | <i>8</i> |
| <i>Circuit-Riding Hearing Officers Improve the Adjudication Process</i> | <i>11</i> |
| <i>The State of Jail Industries</i> | <i>13</i> |
| <i>Recommended Reading</i> | <i>17</i> |

Network News

Highlighting this issue of the *Large Jail Network Bulletin* is a brief summary of the first meeting of network members, held in Denver on June 3-5. Participants discussed strategies in four major areas of jail systems operation and identified topics for discussion at later meetings. Our summary of the meeting begins on page two. The June pilot meeting will be followed by a series of smaller meetings of network members. Each network member will be invited to at least two of the small group meetings.

In addition to this issue's meeting summary, the NIC Information Center and Jails Division are publishing a separate, expanded report of the meeting. It will be completed shortly and distributed to network members. Copies will be available to others on request from the Information Center.

To continue to make the *Bulletin* as useful as possible, and at the suggestion of network meeting participants, the Information Center will with this issue begin distributing an additional unbound copy of the *Bulletin* to each network member. This will enable members to make copies of each issue for distribution within their agencies.

If you are interested in submitting an article to the *Large Jail Network Bulletin* or would like to suggest a topic for an article, contact Barbara Krauth at the NIC Information Center, 1790 30th Street, Suite 130, Boulder, Colorado 80301, or call her at (303) 939-8877.

Large Jails Network Meeting Facilitates Information-Sharing

**by Karen Fisher,
Publications Staff, NIC
Information Center**

The wish of large jail administrators to discuss common problems and issues with their peers became a reality in early June at the first meeting of the Large Jail Network. At the invitation of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) Jails Division, thirty-seven administrators of large jails and jail systems gathered in Denver June 3-5 to discuss areas of correctional practice they stated as among their greatest concerns. This meeting will serve as a model for several other meetings of network members during the 1991 fiscal year,

The Large Jail Network is a group of sixty-seven administrators of jails

The meeting opened with a presentation by NIC Director M. Wayne Huggins, followed by group discussions on crowding issues, special programs, and boot camps.

and jail systems that have an average daily population of 1,000 or more inmates. The concept for the network originated when participants in "mega-jail" meetings in the early

1980s said that they would like opportunities to interact with other large jail administrators and learn what their peers were doing in their respective jurisdictions.

The NIC Jails Division first responded by initiating the *Large Jails Network Bulletin* to facilitate communication among the jail administrators. The *Bulletin* is, in part, an expansion of the mega-jail survey data published previously by Maricopa County (Arizona) Deputy Director Phillip Severson and now included annually in the *Bulletin*. The *Bulletin* is produced by the staff of the NIC Information Center and was introduced at a meeting of large jail administrators in Phoenix in April 1989.

To further facilitate administrators' interaction, in early 1990 the Jails Division polled network members regarding topics they would most like to discuss with their peers. Respondents were invited to the June meeting, and the topics mentioned most frequently

became the meeting's agenda. Administrators who said they would like to speak on those topics were invited to make brief presentations to the group.

The meeting, chaired by NIC Jails Division Chief Mike O'Toole, began with an opening presentation by NIC Director M. Wayne Huggins on current issues and initiatives that affect large jails. This was followed by panel and group discussions on four topics: a systems approach to jail crowding and population management, managing the crowded jail, special programs, and boot camps.

NIC Director Huggins Opens Meeting

Among current initiatives affecting jails, Mr. Huggins noted that the Corrections Options Incentive Act (H.R. 4158), then in congressional hearings, would allocate \$208 million to state and local correctional agencies to develop intermediate sanctions. In addition, he outlined a new NIC initiative to establish four jail resource centers in locations around the country. Each resource center will assist jurisdictions in an area of correctional practice, including direct supervision, facilities planning, jail industries, and objective classification. NIC is also collaborating with the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance to provide money for jails to develop industries and to help local corrections agencies to procure surplus state and federal government lands.

In his remarks, Mr. Huggins commented on the significant progress local correctional facilities are making toward establishing smoke-free jails. He also strongly recommended that jails seek accreditation.

Topic I: Systems Approaches to Jail Crowding and Population Management

Successful approaches to population management take into account the roles played by various groups, both within the jail and in the community at large.

- Tom Allison, director of the Orange County (Florida) Corrections Division, explained that Orange County's Inmate Management System encourages the flow of information among administrators, middle managers, and line staff. Delegation is key in this system, and staff are expected to make immediate decisions within their level of authority. Inmates, too, are given some responsibility; their behavior influences their level of confinement and, therefore, their privileges.
- Barbara Bostick, commissioner of the Baltimore City Jail, described how actors from several branches of the criminal justice system cooperated to reduce the jail's population, which had been exceeding its federally mandated cap. An important component of the effort was to release into the community up to 800 low-risk,

low-bail inmates. The mayor, judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and public and private community groups all contributed to the effort to keep the jail population within its limit.

- In King County (Seattle), Washington, the jail director and the county executive convened a criminal justice committee that eventually made forty-seven recommendations for reducing jail crowding. Ray Coleman, Assistant Director of the King County Department of Adult Detention, described how a carefully conceived strategy resulted in continuing cooperation among all players in the area's criminal justice system.

Participants noted that a wide range of diversion programs are needed to keep offenders who are not a danger to the community out of jail.

However, because there are some people who should be in jail, jails will continue to be built.

Managing the jail population effectively depends on the involvement and support of all participants in the system.

Topic II: Managing the Crowded Jail

Managing crowded facilities requires both reducing the number of inmates and using scarce resources within facilities as wisely as possible.

- John Simonet, director of the Denver County Jail, advocated working with police departments

and other agencies to develop standards of incarceration to help determine more objectively who should be jailed. Within the jail, Mr. Simonet suggested that increasing outdoor recreation time reduces tension by effectively doubling inmates' space.

- Extreme overcrowding frequently precipitates problems in such areas as programming, building maintenance, logistics, communications, and health care. Mark Kellar, director of the Harris County (Houston), Texas, Central Jail, described how a medical emergency brought home the need for contingency planning to handle these problems.

Participants emphasized the importance of several factors in managing crowded jails, including the following:

- Jurisdictions should control the population at the front end wherever possible, for example, by implementing intermediate sanctions.
- A proactive approach is essential. Administrators should work with judges and others in the criminal justice system to explain the jail's needs.
- Keeping a clean facility is important for disease control as well as for staff and inmate morale.
- Adding or expanding programs and activities helps diffuse stress by keeping inmates busy.

Topic III: Special Programs

Although in the past jail administrators might have debated whether programming is necessary, today it is commonly accepted that good programming is good management. Discussions now focus on program funding and on tailoring the program to the inmate.

- David Bosman, director of the Pima County (Tucson), Arizona, Jail, noted that many programs (e.g., literacy programs, religious counseling) can be obtained free though community organizations and local, state, and federal government sources. With minimal training in security issues, volunteers can be very effective instructors in jails.
- Programs are a tool for managing the population and a means for intervening in inmates' lives. Alcohol and drug counseling programs are essential for breaking the cycle of crime. Frank Hall, director of the Santa Clara County (California) Department of Corrections, described two intensive alcohol and drug treatment programs offered within that facility. He noted that isolating programs (e.g., drug counseling, alcohol counseling, GED, prenatal education) within a single jail module reinforces program values.
- Jerry Krans, Assistant Sheriff in Orange County, California, described creative financing of jail programs through cooperation

with local school and community college districts. In one effort, jail woks became certified as vocational instructors, and the facility thus became eligible for community college funds to teach inmates culinary arts. School district funds were also used to teach inmates construction skills, which enabled them to repair and build housing.

Participants noted that a computer data bank or other means of information-sharing might enable administrators to keep up with programming ideas. Program evaluation is essential for determining which programs are most effective for specific inmate groups.

Topic IV: Boot Camps

Like prisons, jails are beginning to offer military-style work camps to motivate selected, nonviolent inmates. Panelists reported on two existing programs and one that will open in August 1990.

- Dick Bryce, Assistant Sheriff, Ventura County (California) Sheriffs Department, described the Rose Valley Work Camp, a converted Navy Seabee camp in a remote part of the Los Padres National Forest. The camp's program combines military drills with work assignments, educational programs or substance abuse counseling, and recreation.

To be eligible for the program, inmates must be classified minimum security and must be considered nonviolent. They are allowed special privileges, such as frequent visitors and phone calls. Inmates have responded well to

Today it is commonly accepted that good programming is good management. Discussions now focus on program funding and on tailoring the program to the inmate.

the program, taking pride in their accomplishments and saying that they see some value in staying clean and sober.

- The Orleans County (Louisiana) "About Face" program, described by Criminal Sheriff Charles Foti, is housed in barracks within the Community Correction Center in New Orleans. Although the program at first was totally military, jail administrators soon realized that education, job training, and counseling were essential for changing inmates' behavior.

Participants are sentenced, nonviolent felony offenders who are expected to stay in the program at least six months. The inmates have established good relationships with the community through neighborhood improvement projects and participation in athletic events. No inmate who has completed the program has been denied a request for parole.

- Bob Ciulik, Chief, Custody Division, Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department, reported the department's plans to open a boot camp this summer in a minimum security compound of an existing facility. The Regimented Inmate Diversion (RID) program will accommodate up to 336 men who would otherwise be sentenced to one year in jail. For the first year, the \$3.7 million needed for the program will come from drug forfeiture money.

RID will be modeled after the New York state shock incarceration program and will emphasize physical training and strict discipline. Mandatory reading instruction and job skills training, substance abuse counseling, group therapy, and work in the jail system's laundry are also program components. The program's goals are to help inmates develop self-respect by learning job and interpersonal skill and to reduce the need for more jails by reducing pretrial incarceration and recidivism.

Participants commented that boot camp staff should not include those who want to use excessive force or who have a "bad attitude." The NIC Jail Center is collecting information about jail-operated boot camps, and some jails are evaluating the camps' effectiveness, primarily through recidivism information.

Future Directions

Based on participants' discussion, three network meetings will be scheduled in fiscal year 1991. The meetings will last one and one-half days, and several topics will be discussed in a format similar to this meeting's schedule. Network members will be asked to choose the meeting dates most convenient to them, and, ideally, each member will be able to attend one or two meetings.

The group suggested a number of topics for discussion in the following general categories:

- Large Jail Network issues;
- Media, public policy, and public relations;
- Crowding strategies (external and internal);
- Resource management and jail operation;
- Public/private sector relationships;
- Program issues, especially mental health management;
- Legal issues and liability; and
- New technologies.

Members will be asked to rank subtopics from these areas to determine which issues will be discussed at the upcoming meetings.

One of the proposed topics, the range of jails' medical costs, is currently the subject of a NIC Jails Division technical assistance grant to

Maricopa County. Regarding a second topic, Dick Bryce of Ventura County has proposed that an ad hoc working group be formed from members of the network to obtain information on food costs.

The enthusiastic involvement of participants at this meeting demonstrated how the Large Jails Network can be an effective arrangement through which jail administrators can share their knowledge and experience to effectively meet their unique challenges.

Note:

Videotapes describing Ventura County's Rose Valley Work Camp and the Orleans County "About Face" program are available on loan from the NIC Information Center. ■

The Hampden County Day Reporting Center: Three Years' Success in Supervising Sentenced Individuals in the Community

**By Richard J. McCarthy,
Public Information Officer,
Hampden County,
Massachusetts, Sheriffs
Department**

In Massachusetts, the county correctional system incarcerates both those in pre-trial detention and those sentenced to terms of two and one-half years or less for crimes such as breaking and entering, larceny, driving while intoxicated, and drug possession. Thus, each county facility is both a jail for pre-trial detainees and a house of correction for sentenced individuals. The sheriff of each county, an

went with the job, but to turn it instead into a pre-release center. Inmates in residence at the center are within six months of release and are able to work and participate in community activities. These activities range from Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous groups to individual counseling, religious services, "work-out" regimens at the YMCA, and community restitution.

In October 1986, faced like many other correctional administrators with worsening overcrowding, Sheriff Ashe instituted what the Crime and Justice Foundation refers to as the first day reporting center in the nation. The day reporting center was located in the county's

pre-release center, so that the new operation could draw on the pre-release center staff's experience in

supervising offenders in the community. In addition, pre-release center staff member Kevin Warwick was selected to direct the day reporting center.

Program Description. The Hampden County Day Reporting Center supervises inmates who are

within four months of release and who live at home, work, and take part in positive activities in the community. Participants' behavior is monitored in several ways:

- They must report into the center daily to be observed by staff;
- They must call in daily at several specified times;
- They must be at home when scheduled to be there, to receive random computer calls from an electronic monitoring system; and
- They must pass frequent random urinalysis tests that detect alcohol or drug use.

Participants also are monitored randomly by "community officers." Under this system, each participant is contacted between fifty and eighty times per week.

Day reporting center participants meet with their counselors at the beginning of each week to chart out a schedule of work and attendance at positive community activities. They are responsible for following this schedule to the letter.

It is important to note that the Hampden County day reporting center is not a "house arrest" program; participants spend a good

Total contacts under the Hampden County program range from fifty to eighty per participant, per week.

elected official, is the administrator of the jail and house of correction.

Sheriff Michael J. Ashe, Jr. has been in charge of the Hampden County Jail and House of Correction in Springfield, Massachusetts for more than fifteen years. One of his early actions as sheriff was to choose not to live in the "Sheriff's House" that

deal of time out of their homes, re-entering the community. Day reporting is also not a diversion program. Sheriff Ashe was concerned that, if used as a diversion program, day reporting would just "widen the net," so that offenders

completed the program. Twenty percent have been returned to higher security, usually for lack of accountability (e.g., not following the required schedule) or a failed urinalysis test. Under the program, one "dirty" urine (testing positive for either alcohol or drugs) results in a return to higher security. This strict policy was established because of the pre-release center's experience that alcohol or drug use was the

program are considerably less than costs for twenty-four-hour lock-up. Day reporting is also the ultimate "carrot" in our institutional incentive-based program participation philosophy; inmates who behave well in jail can serve the end of their sentences at home.

We have also found that individuals who earn the opportunity for home and community participation at the end of their sentences have an improved chance of successful community re-entry. When sentences are a continuum of earned lesser sanctions, the final step to productive and positive community living is much easier than when inmates are released from a higher-security setting. Day reporting also benefits the community because participants work, pay taxes, and perform community service.

We in Hampden County would be happy to share information about our experience in implementing and operating the day reporting center with any interested jurisdictions. For more information, write to Richard McCarthy, Public Information Officer at the Hampden County Sheriffs Department, 79 York Street, Springfield, Massachusetts 01105, or call (413) 781-1560, ext. 213. ■

Day reporting is the ultimate "carrot" in our incentive-based program participation philosophy; inmates who behave well in jail can serve the end of their sentences at home.

who would not have otherwise gone to jail would be sentenced to day reporting.

Day reporting participants are still on sentence, in the custody of the sheriff, and have earned their way into the day reporting program by positive behavior and program participation. Some participants "graduate" from pre-release center in-house status to day reporting. Others, on shorter sentences, come right from the main institution to day reporting. All have been assessed for entrance into the program based on the likelihood of their being accountable for their behavior in the community.

Program success. Nearly 500 individuals have participated in the day reporting center program to date, and, because of the program's close supervision, none has committed a violent crime in the community while in the program. Eighty percent of participants have successfully

primary reason that program participants caused problems in the community.

Pre-trial participants. During the past year, the day reporting program has expanded to provide some supervision of pre-trial individuals, who are released by the court on personal recognizance with the provision that they report daily to the day reporting center, even though they are not in the custody of the sheriff. These individuals do not receive the full services or supervision of day reporting, but their daily reporting is seen by the court as preferable to a release on personal recognizance with no stipulations for reporting at all.

Benefits. Advantages of the day reporting center to our department are numerous. Cell and bed spaces are saved for those who need them the most. Costs of supervising participants in the day reporting

Cook/Chill Centralized Food Service in Corrections

By Louise E. Mathews, Chief of Food Services, San Diego County, California, Sheriffs Department

Bread, gruel, and water used to be the staples of correctional food service, but today a great variety of high-quality food is available, thanks to such technology as food factories, computerized menus, robot delivery systems, and centralized "cook/chill" processing.

Several factors underlie the need for corrections to try new, more efficient approaches to food service. These factors include jail crowding; the rapid growth in demand for food service; increasing food, labor, and supply costs; a shortage of trained personnel; and an increasing number of food service-related lawsuits throughout the nation.

Crowding was a primary reason for changes in San Diego's food service

Crowding was a primary reason for changes in San Diego's food service system.

system. San Diego County's seven facilities were designed for a legal

capacity of 2,345. In 1989, these facilities were holding up to 4,500 inmates-and the numbers were climbing-giving San Diego the dubious distinction of being the most overcrowded system in the country.

To determine more effective ways of handling the increasing number of inmates, the county commissioned two external feasibility studies (1985 and 1989), as well as an internal study. With respect to food service, the findings of all the studies supported the creation of a centralized cook/chill system for the county's facilities.

Cook/Chill Processing

Cook/chill is a technique for preparing food in large volume that extends its shelf life while maintaining product quality. Food is cooked conventionally to pasteurization temperature then chilled rapidly. The food is stored in a temperature-controlled environment above the freezing point (from 32 to 37 degrees Fahrenheit) and then reheated immediately before consumption. Rapid chilling inhibits the multiplication of bacteria, thus retarding the deterioration of food that occurs at normal temperatures.

There are two basic methods of cook/chill: cryo-vat (tumble chilling), and blast chilling.

Cryo-vat processing. In cryo-vat (tumble chill) processing, liquid or viscous products such as sauces, soups, stews, cereals, and salad dressings are prepared in specially equipped kettles and then pumped through a three-inch hose into polyethylene bags (usually two-gallon bags). The bags are vacuum-sealed and transferred to the chilling unit, either manually or by conveyor belt. The chiller is a perforated drum that rotates in a tank of circulating ice water. The bags of food are tumbled in the ice bath until their temperature is below 38 degrees. The cryo-vat process gives the product a shelf life of thirty to forty days.

Blast-chilling. Other foods, such as baked chicken, meat loaf, lasagna, and hamburgers, are cooked and then placed on carts in two-inch-deep pans and rolled into a "blast" chilling unit, which resembles a roll-in refrigerator box. The unit has the ability to rapidly circulate cold air around the pans until the food temperature has dropped below 38 degrees. Blast-chilling gives the product a shelf life of four to five days.

When the food products are needed, they can be transported to the facility, where they are heated and served. A more efficient alternative to shipping food in bulk is to

prepackage individual entree servings on trays before shipping.

Reheating is done in special “rethermalizing” units. These units bring food to the proper temperature

and then stop heating; the units are portable and do not require a hood and ventilation system. The advantages of cook/chill processing are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1. Advantages of Cook/Chill Food Processing

Labor savings

- Production staff can concentrate on specific tasks throughout the day with little or no peak meal-time tension.
- In most systems, seven days’ food can be prepared in a four- or five-day kitchen work week.
- Agencies can keep key cooking staff to a minimum by using relatively unskilled labor to reheat and serve food.

Energy savings

- More efficient use of production equipment can result in reduced energy costs.
- Because staff can prepare food over a four- or five-day work week to serve seven days, the kitchen can be shut down for two or more days, also resulting in energy savings.

Consistency/quality control

- Controlled, uniform production techniques assure that a product is the same each time it is made. National restaurant chains use this process to assure uniform high quality in their outlets across the country.
- In a properly supervised central kitchen cook/chill facility, it is easier to control quality, and there is less opportunity for inmate workers to tamper with the food.

Service flexibility

- Because products are maintained in inventory, special diets and off-peak feeding are simplified.

Space savings

- Because bulk production equipment is usually used, total kitchen space is reduced, despite the need for increased refrigeration.

Equipment savings

- Duplicate full kitchen equipment need not be purchased and maintained at each facility.
- Equipment maintenance is concentrated at the central kitchen, with minimum requirements at the rethermalization satellite kitchens.

Management

- Management functions are centered primarily in one kitchen operation with the appropriate technical/administrative support, an arrangement that helps to compensate to some degree for the shortage of qualified food service management personnel.

San Diego's Food Services Center

To incorporate this new technology, a new, central food service production center is currently being constructed at San Diego County's East Mesa Detention Facility in Otay Mesa; it is scheduled to open early in 1991. The 38,000-square-foot center will encompass the latest developments in cook/chill technology, as well as a state-of-the-art bakery and a specially designed computer system.

production center will initially serve 2,000 staff and inmates; however, it is designed to eventually produce 29,000 meals per day to accommodate 7,000 inmates and staff in the proposed honor camps and jails on the Otay Mesa site. San Diego is one of the first correctional agencies to use cook/chill processing, and will be the first to adopt a system of pre-packing entrees.

As a recent feasibility study has shown, with some additions and modifications the food production

center would be capable of serving other county detention facilities as well. This expansion would be

San Diego County. The technique has enabled some private industries to reduce labor costs by 40 percent. But most important, central food processing will allow the department to provide high-quality service in a consistent and professional manner.

For further information contact Louise E. Mathews, Chief of Food Services, by writing to her at the Los Colinas Detention Center, 9000 Cottonwood Avenue, Santee, California, 92040, or call (619) 258-3210. ■

The food production center will initially serve 2,000 staff and inmates and is designed to eventually produce 29,000 meals per day to accommodate 7,000 inmates and staff.

The facility will also feature a complete cold production center for preparing such foods as salads, vegetables, and sandwiches, and a tray line assembly system. A larger, separate ingredient control area will include more than 3,000 square feet of freezer capacity and 4,000 square feet of dry storage. By enabling the department to buy food in large quantities, the center will help reduce purchasing costs by at least 20 percent.

The center will operate ten hours per day, five days per week, which assures cost-efficiency as well as quality control. All menu components will be prepared to meet an inventory rather than specific meal requirements. The food

possible because of the versatility of the cook/chill food preparation system, used in conjunction with a distribution system for transporting the food to the other sites.

Based on the feasibility study, it has been recommended that San Diego County construct two more central food production centers by the year 2007 to handle the burgeoning inmate population. These centers will support numerous new facilities throughout the county, with only rethermalization units needed at each site.

As outlined in this article, use of a centralized cook/chill approach to food service will generate a definite cost savings for

Circuit-Riding Hearing Officers Improve the Adjudication Process

**by Robert Daly,
General Counsel, New York
City Department of Correction**

Riding the circuit" is an American tradition. Almost every large pioneer settlement had a church, but many lacked ordained ministers to conduct services for a growing frontier population. A traveling preacher visited many settlements regularly to conduct church services. The preacher was called a "circuit rider" because he rode horseback from one settlement to another on a route known as a circuit.

A similar approach was used in the court system. In the early years of the nation's independence, United States federal judges traveled from courthouse to courthouse to try cases and to hear appeals. The route assigned to the court was called the circuit. By 1790 Congress had divided the thirteen states into three circuits, and many state judges also rode county circuits. Lawyers usually traveled with the judges to argue cases brought before the court.

The circuit concept has extended into modern times. The men and women who conduct inmate disciplinary hearings for the New York City Department of Correction

still work in a similar fashion, although the buggy has given way to the automobile.

On any given day, the department is charged with the custody of 20,000 detainees and sentenced inmates. That inmate population is dispersed in seventeen major facilities. Although some of those facilities hold several hundred inmates, others hold more than 2,000. Because 75 percent of the inmate population consists of detainees held for relatively brief periods, total admissions exceed 120,000 in a calendar year. This inmate population generates approximately 35,000 infractions each year that require disposition. That task is performed by the department's fourteen circuit riders who make up the adjudication unit.

The seminal case outlining the minimal due process requirements of prison and jail inmate disciplinary hearings is *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418

US. 539 (1974). *Wolff* and subsequent cases require disciplinary hearings to be conducted by an impartial hearing officer or board if the requirements of due process are to be satisfied. To make a hearing as

impartial as possible, the board or officer conducting the hearing ideally should have no prior knowledge of the incident giving rise to the infraction. This requires, at a minimum, no direct involvement in the incident and no involvement in the routine, pre-hearing preparation of the reports and evidence to be presented at the hearing.

Over the years the department has experimented with several models to help achieve impartiality. Three-member disciplinary committees have evolved into single, specially trained hearing officers.

Trained, full-time hearing officers offer several advantages over hearing board members drawn on a rotating basis from regular facility uniformed and civilian staff, given the growing complexity of

To make a hearing as impartial as possible, the board or officer conducting the hearing ideally should have no prior knowledge of the incident giving rise to the infraction.

conducting hearings that will withstand court challenges and make the most effective use of staff resources. Advantages include:

- Greater expertise in conducting hearings, gained, in part, from introductory and ongoing training;
- More efficient use of staff time by having a single staff member replace three-member committees;
- Improved written decisions that will be upheld when scrutinized by a reviewing court; and
- The opportunity to create a professional corps of truly impartial hearing officers, in fact and in appearance.

The hearing officers of the department's adjudication unit are all members of the uniformed force who have volunteered for the assignment. They are veteran first-line supervisors with many years of facility experience as officers and supervisors. Each is assigned to the adjudication unit on a full-time basis and performs no other facility assignments. The officers conduct all business wearing civilian clothes to

The hearing officers are under the direct supervision of a legal division attorney who provides ongoing training and provides guidance in situations requiring legal expertise.

be further distinguished from facility staff.

Most important, the hearing officers report, not to the head of the facility to which they are assigned, but to the corrections department's general

counsel. This arrangement helps to insulate their decisions from influence by facility administrators and helps prevent them from identifying with facility staff.

To maintain that independence, the unit's members "ride-the circuit" by rotating from one facility to another every twenty working days. Because of substantial differences in the number of inmates assigned to facilities, some facilities are assigned two hearing officers while others share the services of a single hearing officer. After four weeks, all members of the unit report to their next assignment as they rotate throughout all the department's facilities. The hearing officers are under the direct supervision of a legal division attorney who provides ongoing training and is available to provide guidance in situations requiring legal expertise.

The New York City Department of Correction's size and the proximity of its correctional facilities to one another lends itself to this unique arrangement. Although this system may be difficult to replicate in another setting, we believe it has features that other jail systems may wish to consider:

- It promotes impartiality by having hearing officers report to an

administrator outside the facility hierarchy;

- It removes hearing officers from other line responsibility to prevent them from being involved in incidents they may have to adjudicate;
- It places hearing officers in civilian clothes to prevent their automatic identification with line staff in the eyes of the inmates being charged; and
- It professionalizes hearing officers through periodic training and access to legal advice.

These aspects of our system can improve the hearing process in all jail systems.

For further information, contact Robert Daly at the New York City Department of Correction, 60 Hudson Street, New York, New York 10013-4393, or phone him at (212) 266-1284. ■

The State of Jail Industries

**by Robert J. Gorski, Ph.D.,
Director, PHILACOR, and
Victor J. Jacobsen, Criminal
Justice Consultant, United
States Manufacturers
Corporation**

In June 1984, former U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren E. Burger convened a conference called "Factories Within Fences" to provide a platform for discussing the importance of work and training for inmates in the corrections system. The conference generated great interest in, and enthusiasm for, correctional industry programs. Since then, as never before, a tremendous amount of attention has been focused on the idea of operating industries within the walls of prisons and jails.

In times of lean budgets, rising jail populations, and increasing outside intervention, a properly managed correctional industry can be of great value.

The main objective of this attention is to transform prisons and jails from human warehouses into productive work places that contribute to the community in a variety of ways. As a result, new and innovative

programs have been started across the country. These programs have received support from the private and public sectors, the judicial and executive branches of government, and the academic community.

The concept of correctional industries is not new. State and federal correctional systems have been using industries as a way of managing inmates for at least a century. Programs have grown from the simple manufacturing of bricks and license plates to such complex industries as drafting, printing, computer programming, and even travel-related services, such as hotel/motel and airline reservations.

The benefits and shortcomings of operating a business within a correctional facility are documented and available for correctional administrators to study. In times of lean budgets, rising jail populations, and increasing outside intervention, a properly managed correctional industry can be of great value. Industries can reduce idleness,

provide valuable work experience for inmates, realize a profit to supplement existing resources, and help inmates earn money to support their dependents on the outside, thus

reducing families' dependence on public support.

Trends Supporting Jail Industries

Several trends exist within the field of corrections and criminal justice that strongly support the concept of prison and jail industries. Prison and jail crowding, alternative sentencing, judicial support and attention, and the cost of incarceration all point to the value and feasibility of correctional industries.

Crowding. At the end of 1988, the nation's jail and prison populations were at an all-time high. The number of state and federal prisoners exceeded 450,000, and rates of arrest and conviction gave no sign of relief.¹ By 1990, there were more than one million jail and prison inmates. The U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that in 1988, 14,314 state inmates were being held in local jails waiting for bed space in state facilities.² Data included in the same report indicate that relief is not in sight; increasing numbers of prisoners were being housed in state and federal prisons, and an additional burden was being placed on local jail facilities.

With the rise in prison and jail populations, an increasing number of inmates find themselves in close physical quarters with no release

mechanisms for the stress that is associated with crowding. Idleness is particularly pervasive in local jails, most of which were constructed as short-term holding facilities for a basically transient inmate population. Neither space nor constructive programming is available in the majority of jails, and inmates have little, if anything, to occupy their time.

Inmate idleness has been cited in many cases, dating back to one of the earliest conditions of confinement cases, *Pugh v. Locke* (406 F Supp 318 (MD Ala 1976). 406 F Supp at 329). The court specifically mentioned "overwhelming idleness" as one of the conditions that led it to conclude that the conditions violated "any current judicial definition of cruel and unusual punishment. . . ."

Alternative sentencing. Many communities are increasingly using alternative sentences that emphasize the use of sanctions other than incarceration, diverting offenders from jail to less secure residential facilities. Alternative facilities include community-based correctional centers and residential work release, alcohol/drug abuse treatment, and community work programs. These facilities offer a less restrictive environment in which industries can be operated with fewer custody and security concerns. An industry attached to this type of facility can be an excellent community resource and may

produce sufficient revenues to become self-supporting.

Judicial support and attention. At the 1984 "Factories with Fences" conference, Chief Justice Burger noted that "the number of inmates who enter our prisons as functional illiterates, lacking any marketable skills, is staggering." He encouraged correctional systems to work with private industry in establishing "real work" experiences for inmates, stating that "the key to every good system is work, work, work, along with education and vocational training."³

Chief Justice Burger was also instrumental in establishing the National Center for Innovation in Corrections at George Washington University, which was in operation from October 1985 to November 1988. The center's purpose was to "enhance the use of prison industries to alleviate idleness caused by overcrowding; increase productivity through prison industries; and establish programs designed to help inmates defray some of the costs of incarceration."

Costs of incarceration. The costs of building and maintaining secure facilities continue to rise. Although the cost of constructing a jail cell can range from \$25,000 to \$75,000, the cost of maintaining the average inmate in a prison/jail environment

can be anywhere from \$11,000 to \$20,000 a year, equivalent to the cost of a college education.

Programs that defray these costs are most attractive. In 1984, the National Association of Counties (NACo) awarded its Outstanding Achievement Award to a county that implemented an alternative work program for alcohol-related driving offenses. This program provided the county with 230 persons who worked on county road improvements and saved the county an estimated \$50,000 in incarceration costs and 5,500 manhours in labor.

In 1989, NACo took a strong policy stand in support of the development of jail industries.⁴ This position emphasizes the involvement of jails,

Warren Burger stated that "the key to every good system is work, work, work, along with education and vocational training."

organized labor, and the business community so that industry programs can realize their fullest potential.

A number of counties have implemented inmate work programs. For example, Dade County, Florida, has a landscaping program; Middlesex County, New Jersey, has an auto repair program; and Hennepin County, Minnesota, is producing picnic tables that are sold within the county. Other programs include repair of county vehicles,

park benches, and picnic tables and refurbishment of garbage dumpsters. Many of these programs can be developed into revenue-producing businesses that will help the local government offset some of the costs of incarcerating and supervising offenders.

The PHILACOR Program

With a population of more than 5,000 inmates, the Philadelphia prison (jail) system had a definite need to provide useful programs for inmate participation. Thus PHILACOR, the system's correctional industries division, was established as a method to reduce inmate idleness and increase productivity. Currently, 301 inmates participate in eight basic industries at three facilities in the system.

Philadelphia Industrial Correctional Center. Industries underway at the Philadelphia Industrial Correctional Center (PICC) include programs in manufacturing and refurbishing furniture:

- The furniture manufacturing program is made up of several components. In the carpentry area, inmates assemble component parts. In a second area, upholstery, inmates upholster new furniture and reupholster furniture from other government agencies. Inmates also perform wood finishing of newly assembled products and refinish items, including delicate antique

furniture, sent to PHILACOR for specific refinishing processes.

- In the furniture refurbishing program, inmates refinish metal furniture, including desks, file cabinets, tables, and other pieces, which are recycled back into the system. It is interesting to note that, if this industry did not exist, most of the metal furniture being refurbished would have been discarded by the government, because refinishing it is not cost-effective except in the prison setting.

Philadelphia House of Correction.

This facility operates three industry programs: a laundry, a dry cleaning plant, and a general products plant.

- The laundry and dry cleaning operations clean all clothing, linens, and other items used in the Philadelphia system.
- The general products plant is responsible for making mattresses, mops, and pillows and for plastic engraving.

Holmesburg Prison. Holmesburg, the maximum security unit of the Philadelphia system, houses three industrial operations:

- A barricade manufacturing operation makes all of the barricades used by the Philadelphia Police Department.
- Holmesburg inmates manufacture all cloth items used by the inmate population, including shirts, pants,

sheets, pillow cases, and bakers' Shirts.

- A Holmesburg plant prints all of the forms used in the prison system as well as doing general printing for other government agencies.

Industries in the development stage are outdoor furniture, street signs, office systems furniture, restaurant management, landscaping, and janitorial services. This expansion will allow the system to provide employment for a total of 500 inmates.

Any inmate may apply for the industries program at the facility where he/she is being held. The only requirements are a desire to work and the physical ability to do so. Training is provided on the job by industries staff who are both journeymen in their trades and qualified correctional officers. Inmates usually remain in the program for the duration of their incarceration; the average length of stay is ten months for sentenced individuals and six months for those without sentences.

PHILACOR is dedicated to involving as many inmates in the program as feasible, while generating revenue that can be used to partially offset costs of incarceration. Sales of products and services will exceed \$1 million in the 1990 fiscal year.

The industries program has faced some opposition from labor unions,

whose leaders argue that it takes jobs away from union workers. Gradually, however, the unions are realizing that the program is necessary to offset incarceration costs and that industries perform

Jail industries have the potential to reduce the tax burden to the community that results from expanding, maintaining, and operating jails—or at least keep it from increasing.

work that would not be done otherwise.

It is anticipated that in the 1991 fiscal year, PHILACOR will assume total responsibility for operating the industries program. Specifically, PHILACOR will purchase all supplies for the industries and will sell its services at cost to the system and other agencies. Under this organization the program should net a savings of \$2.5 million per fiscal year. Eventually PHILACOR will incorporate as a nonprofit organization.

Jail Industries Today

Under National Institute of Corrections (NIC) sponsorship, the Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc., conducted a survey in 1984 to assess the status of jail industries. The primary audience of the survey was the nation's sixty-nine largest jail systems, which operate the 100 largest jails. The resultant report also included in-depth interviews with officials at

the thirteen jails known to be operating industries⁵

Since that initial study NIC and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) have joined forces to support the development of **jail industries nationally. Under an NIJ grant, a team of experts has developed a resource manual to assist jail**

managers in the development and daily operation of industry programs⁶ Throughout fiscal years 1990 and 1991, NIC and NIJ will support this development by conducting regional training workshops and providing short-term technical assistance.

The Future of Jail Industry

Can correctional industry work in jails? We believe it can and must. Public policy makers and correctional administrators have a responsibility to ensure that local correctional systems are operated as efficiently as possible. An industry has the potential to reduce the tax burden to the community that results from expanding, maintaining, and operating the jail-or at least keep it from increasing.

In addition, the courts have made it clear that idleness in facilities is not acceptable and that meaningful work and program experiences for inmates are most desirable. Last, and most important, the inmates stand to benefit the most from correctional

industries. Industries provide work experience, dignity, and a better chance to succeed in the workplace upon release.

For further information, contact Robert Gorski at PHILACOR, 8301 State Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19136, or call (215) 335-7134.

References

1. "Record 454,138 in Prisons as Crime Rates Fall." *New York Times*, August 28, 1984.
2. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. "Prisoners in 1984." *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin*, April 1985.
3. Burger, Warren Speech presented at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., June 15, 1984.
4. Miller, Rod. "County Jail Industries Gaining Momentum" *County News* 21 (November 20, 1989): 14.
5. Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Inc., and National Institute of Corrections. *The Development of Jail Industries*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 1985.
6. Sexton, George E., Rod Miller, and Victor J. Jacobsen. *Operating Jail Industries: A Resource Manual*. Washington, DC.: National Institute of Justice, in press. ■

Recommended Reading

A Report of the Findings of a Survey of the Nation's Jails. Regarding Jail Drug Treatment Programs (Draft). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1990.

Under a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the American Jail Association has undertaken a program to reduce drug abuse, criminality, and jail crowding by establishing jail drug treatment demonstration projects in several metropolitan jails. This draft report presents the results of the project's first phase.

The survey evaluates the scope of in-jail drug treatment services that were available in 1987 in more than 1,700 jails in forty-eight states. It addresses the characteristics of inmates receiving drug treatment services, program size, types of treatment, factors related to developing in-jail services, program costs, and adjunctive services such as detoxification, drug screening, and correctional officer training.

The report concludes that "despite the high prevalence of drug abuse among inmate populations, and a growing awareness that untreated

drug abusers have a negative impact on all segments of society, most jails do not have adequate drug treatment services." This finding indicates a need to develop standards to guide administrators and treatment staff in providing cost-effective services. The authors also recommend that administrators seek technical assistance regarding these programs.

Jail Classification System Development. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of corrections, 1990.

The materials in this series were prepared by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the Correctional Services Group under a grant from the NIC Jails Division. Five documents are now available to help jail administrators develop, implement, and evaluate objective classification systems that meet the unique needs of jails:

- **Review of the Literature.** Summarizes information on the history of inmate classification, classification in the context of jail settings, and issues in implementing objective jail classification systems.

- **Survey of Jail Classification: A Practical Approach.** Presents results of a 1987 survey of sixty jails regarding information jails were using to classify inmates, as well as classification system policies, procedures, and management.
- **Executive Summary.** Summarizes the project's final report on developing, implementing, and evaluating an objective classification system.
- **Objective Jail Classification System User's Manual.** Instructs staff in how to use the classification system developed during the project. Includes checklists based on well-defined legal characteristics for assessing inmates' custody and programming needs.
- **Evaluating Jail Classification Systems: A Practical Approach.** Provides guidelines to help jail administrators formally evaluate their classification systems and identify where improvement is needed. ■

Copies of these documents may be requested by contacting the NIC Information Center at (303) 939-8877, or sending your request to 1790 30th Street, Suite 130, Boulder, Colorado, 80301.